

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.      | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/681,580           | 10/06/2003  | Glenn H. MacKal      | 380804.00116 6851       |                  |  |
| 7590 04/15/2005      |             |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |  |
| Stefan V. Stein      |             |                      | BOMBERG, KENNETH        |                  |  |
| Holland & Knig       | tht LLP     |                      |                         |                  |  |
| Suite 4100           |             |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| 100 N. Tampa Street  |             |                      | 3754                    |                  |  |
| Tampa, FL 33602-3644 |             |                      | DATE MAILED: 04/15/2005 |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)  | _ |
|-----------------|---------------|---|
| 10/681,580      | MACKAL ET AL. |   |
| Examiner        | Art Unit      | _ |
| Kenneth Bomberg | 3754          |   |

| before the Filling of an Appeal Brief   | Examiner   | Art Unit  | •                                      |
|---|--|---|--|
|   | Kenneth Bomberg  | 3754  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence add   | ress                                   |
| THE REPLY FILED 16 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS  | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO  | R ALLOWANCE.  |  |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:  | the same day as filing a Notice of<br>wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff<br>tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o<br>ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu | Appeal. To avoid aba<br>idavit, or other evider<br>compliance with 37 C | nce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)         |
| a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires $3$ months from the mailing date  |  |   |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire it   | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing  | g date of the final rejecti   | on.                                    |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7   | 06.07(f).  |   |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount<br>shortened statutory period for reply origi<br>r than three months after the mailing da                           | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi                     | ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte<br/>a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed<br/>AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>  | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to  | avoid dismissal of th   | ns of the date of<br>e appeal. Since   |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,   | but prior to the date of filing a brief.   | will not be entered be  | ecause                                 |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co   | nsideration and/or search (see NO  | TE below);  |  |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo   |  | ,,  |  |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or   | tter form for appeal by materially re-   | ducing or simplifying   | the issues for                         |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a  |  | ected claims.   |  |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1   | ,  | II  | (DTO) 004)                             |
| <ul><li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1</li><li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ul>  |  | mpliant Amendment   | (PTOL-324).                            |
| '' ''   |  |   |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   | •  | •   | <b>-</b> .                             |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro<br>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  | l be entered and an e   | explanation of                         |
| Claim(s) allowed:   | •  | ,   |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,5,6 and 9</u> .   |  |   | •                                      |
| Claim(s) rejected. 1-0,0,0 and s. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 4,7,8 and 10-17.   |  |   |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |  |   |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |  |   |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of<br>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary  | vercome all rejections under appea   | al and/or appellant fai   | Is to provide a                        |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  | n of the status of the claims after er   | ntry is below or attach   | ned.                                   |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu<br/><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>   | t does NOT place the application in  | condition for allowar   | nce because:                           |
| <ul><li>12. ⊠ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. □ Other:</li></ul>   | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N  | o(s). <u>2/16/05</u>  |  |
| _ · · · <u></u>   |  |   |  |
|   |  |   | •                                      |
|   |  | •   |  |
|   |  |   |  |

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the undulating configuration extending parallel to a plane of said surface raise new issues.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's request for withdrawing the finality of the office action is noted. The basis of the request is that the earlier application was subject to a restriction requirement and the claims examined on the merits in the earlier application were not the ones at issue in this application. The restriction requirement in the parent application (actually an election by original presentation), was between the combination of the inflator and pill and the subcombination of the pill, applicant subsequently received a patent having claims directed to both the combination of the pill and the inflator as well as to the subcombination of the pill alone. With respect to the applicant's cancellation of claims directed to certain species in the parent application, this was done to obviate a species requirement and thereby preclude a requirement for election of species and to place the parent application in immediate condition for allowance. In the present application, in response to an election and species requirement, applicant elected the inflator along with the species of Figs. 2A-2C, however the elected claims to the inflator are generic to all of the species as the pill is not positively recited along with the inflator. The pending claims directed to the generic inflator was never presented and therefore never restricted as a subcombination in the parent application. For the above reasons the applicant's divisional application to the subcombination inflator was not filed in response to the subcombination of the inflator being subject to a restriction requirement.

KENNETH BOMBERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER